

REMARKS

Applicant requests that this amendment submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) be entered and the examination of the application be continued.

At the onset, Applicant notes that claims 28, 29, 32 and 33 have been amended herewith for clarification. For example, claim 28 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, receiving a message on said user equipment including a first list including a plurality of network identifiers corresponding to a plurality of available networks for a potential handover, said receiving from a current active communication network while a call is in progress. Additionally, the claim has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, selecting one network of the plurality of available networks to which the user equipment hands over based upon a comparing of said first list with a second list stored in the user equipment. Further, the claim has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, said current active communication network signals one or more of the plurality of network identifiers corresponding to the plurality of available networks for the potential handover, and said receiving of said message occurs without said user equipment searching any communication network.

Claims 29, 32, and 33 have been similarly amended.

Applicant further notes that claims 34-38 have been added to the application. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the new claims.

Claims 34, 35 and 37 are directed to, *inter alia*, the message received by the user equipment. Claim 36 is directed to, *inter alia*, storing the first list in the user equipment. Claim 38 is directed to, *inter alia*, receiving, by the user equipment, a second message including at least one network identifier corresponding to a network that is to be deleted from the first list.

No new matter has been added to the application by way of the aforementioned amendments and new claims.

For example, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to pages 7-11 and 13-14. Applicant notes that the identified sections of the specification are presented solely for the convenience of the Examiner and are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Applicant submits that the claims (including new claims) are patentable over the references cited in the Final Rejection dated April 1, 2010.

Claims 28, 29 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obviousness over Lynch, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,618 in view of Sturniolo, U.S. Patent No. 6,201,962 in further view of Daly, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,503. Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lynch, Sturniolo, Daly in view of Grandhi, U.S. Patent No. 6,125,280.

Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or even suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

Notably, none of the cited references teach or suggest at least the limitations of receiving a message on said user equipment including a first list including a plurality of network identifiers corresponding to a plurality of available networks for a potential handover, said receiving from a **current active** communication network while a call is in progress and said receiving of said message occurs **without said user equipment searching** any communication network, as recited in the claims.

The claimed invention which is related to techniques for handover from an active network to a selected one of a plurality of potential other networks, describes an **alternative to scanning broadly for available networks** by teaching a User Equipment that is configured to receive a list of networks available for a potential handover, e.g., a first list, from **the active**

network to which the User Equipment is connected (specification, page 10, lines 6-8).

Advantageously, the terminal does not have to waste resources scanning.

By contrast, Lynch describes a cellular telephone system having service providers that are identified by System Identification (SIDs) numbers, and that *each service provider broadcasts* a unique SID (column 1, lines 59-65). A suitably equipped subscriber *scans the wireless system* operating within proximity to the subscriber unit to determine which service provider is providing service in a physical area to which the subscriber unit has roamed.

Sturniolo, Daly and Grandhi fail to cure these deficiencies. Notably, on page 3 of the Final Rejection dated April 1, 2010, the Examiner admitted that “since Sturniolo specifically suggests that ‘the mobile terminal 36 receives a new network identification’ (see col. 6, lines 54-55) from the **second network** (also see fig. 2 step 76), Sturniolo teaches or suggests a mobile device receiving a message information the device that one or more network identifiers are available for potential handover” (emphasis added).

But the claimed invention recites, *inter alia*, that the message is received from current active network, rather than the potential new network, i.e., second network. Therefore, as admitted by the Examiner (in page 3), Sturniolo cannot teach or suggest this feature. Additionally, at best, in Sturniolo the new network broadcasts its own identifier not a list of a plurality of identifiers.

No proper interpretation of Sturniolo suggests receiving the list of available networks from the current active network. Both Daly and Grandhi fail to cure the above-described deficiencies of Lynch and Sturniolo, and the Examiner does not state otherwise. Thus *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, so that these claims are patentable over the cited references.

Applicant further submits that new claims 34-38 are patentable over the above-identified references based at least upon the above-identified analysis. Furthermore Applicant notes that the references fail to at least teach or suggest the limitations of wherein said message is a dedicated message for signaling available networks for handover, as recited, *inter alia*, in claim 34 and wherein said message is periodically transmitted by said current active network without a specific request, as recited, *inter alia*, in claim 35.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests allowance of claims 28, 29, and 32-38 (with 34-38 being new).

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Seth Weinfeld/

Seth Weinfeld
Registration No.50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 400
Garden City NY 11530
516.742.4343

SW:reg